



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,431	08/18/2000	Russell A. Wilson	INTL-0434-US (P9442)	6667

7590

07/29/2003

Timothy N Trop
Trop Pruner & Hu PC
Suite 100
8554 Katy Freeway
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/641,431

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-16 and 20-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-16 and 20-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 5/19/2003.
2. Claims 1-6, 10-16 and 20-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 29 are independent claims. In Amendment A, claims 7-9 and 17-19 are cancelled and claims 1, 11, 21 and 29 were amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-3, 11-13, 20-23 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135).

As per claim 1, Tang teaches a method comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window (figs. 3, 5, and 8), the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient (figs. 3 and 8; *object recipient 21 and 14 respectively*), enabling an object to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping a representation of the object to the icon (figs. 3 and 5; col. 8, lines 36-38), an interface for preparing notes to be transferred from the interface to the communication interface (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 35-37 and fig. 5; col. 9, lines 37-50) and enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note (*element 18 of fig. 1A, element(s) 26 of fig. 5 as well as an appearance of sticky notes in figs. 1B and 3, respectively displayed at the bottom of object 29 and 19*) to be annotated (col. 8, lines 52-54) in order to pass a note to an intended recipient (col. 8, lines 52-56). Tang does not explicitly disclose enabling a

Art Unit: 2174

user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient and enabling the note interface to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping the note to the icon. Fernandes teaches a method comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window, the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient, enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient and enabling the note interface to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping the note to the icon (figs. 3-6; col. 11, lines 35-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fernandes method comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window, the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient, enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient and enabling the note interface to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping the note to the icon to Tang's method of comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window, the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient, enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

Claims 11, 21 and 29 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 2, Tang teaches a method of providing an icon for each of a plurality of users and enabling communications through the communication interface between the users (figs. 3, 5, and 8; icons such as "Julie" and "Susan" communicating via communication interfaces).

Claims 12, 23 and 30 are individually similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 3, Tang teaches a method of providing a home interface for the users and enabling communications between the users and the home interface using the communications interface (*figs. 3, 5, and 8 and respective portions of the specification*).

Claims 13 and 25 are individually similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20 and 28 are individually similar in scope to claim 10 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, Tang teaches a system that includes a display and a mouse coupled to the processor (*fig. 10*).

As per claim 24, Tang teaches a system wherein the storage stores instruction that enable the processor to facilitate communications between users of the same system (*fig. 5 and respective portions of the specification*).

5. Claims 4, 14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of de Hond (US 5,796,395).

As per claim 4, Tang teaches a method of providing access to interfaces, associated with a user, on a user-selected or user initiated basis (col. 8, lines 3-5; col. 10, lines 35-36). Tang does not explicitly disclose providing access to an interface on a password basis. De Hond teaches a method of providing access to interfaces, associated with a user, on a password basis (col. 4, lines 43-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include De Hond's teaching of providing

Art Unit: 2174

access to interfaces on a password basis to Tang's teaching of providing access to interfaces on a user initiated basis in order to provide users with a more secure environment.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365 in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Word 2000 ("MS Word").

As per claim 5, Tang teaches a method of depicting miniature version of objects/images a.k.a. thumbnails (figs. 3, 5, and 8). Tang does not explicitly disclose the thumbnails of the objects to be produced when the object is mouse clicked on. MS Word teaches producing a thumbnail depiction of an object when the object is mouse clicked on (figs. 2-3; *object 200, when clicked on with cursor 210, produces a thumbnail depiction 300 of the object as in fig. 3*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of producing a thumbnail as taught by MS Word to Tang's teaching of the use of thumbnails in order to maximize the display area available.

Claims 15 and 26 are individually similar in scope to claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, MS Word teaches a method of attaching a depiction of the object to a cursor so that the depiction moves as the cursor moves (figs. 3-4; *object is attached to a cursor in fig. 3 and moved as displayed in fig. 4*).

Claims 16 and 27 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hogan (US 5,933,597).

As per claim 10, Tang teaches a method of providing a first interface where objects are persistently stored after being transferred from the first interface (fig.5; *objects 26 are stored in interface 24*) and supports operations to delete objects (col. 11, lines 58-59). Tang does not explicitly disclose a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred from the second interface. Hogan teaches a first interface where objects are stored (fig. 12; *object sharing window 82*) and a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred (col. 8, lines 35-38; *such as the case wherein text strings are transferred in a drag and drop operation*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include Hogan's teaching of a first interface where objects are stored and a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred to Tang's method of providing a first interface where objects are persistently stored after being transferred from the first interface and the capability to delete objects in order to provide users with a time-saving method of deleting objects automatically.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants' argument with respect to claim 1 has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.13(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Application/Control Number: 09/641,431

Page 8

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen
Patent Examiner
July 28, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100